DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 343 905 SP 033 737

AUTHOR	Stoddart, Trish
TITLE	Los Angeles Unified School District Intern Program: Recruiting and Preparing Teachers for an Urban Context.
INSTITUTION	National Center for Research on Teacher Education, East Lansing, MI.; Policy Analysis for California Education, Berkeley, CA.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.; William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, Palo Alto, Calif.
REPORT NO	PACE-PP91-10-1
PUB DATE	Oct 91
NOTE	45p.
AVAILABLE FROM	PACE, School of Education, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720 ($8.00).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Alternative Teacher Certification; Comparative Analysis; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Inner City; *Inservice Teacher Education; Low Income Groups; Minority Groups; Misassignment of Teachers; Multicultural Education; *On the Job Training; School Districts; *Teacher Interns; *Teacher Qualifications; Teacher Recruitment; *Teacher Shortage
IDENTIFIERS	*Los Angeles Unified School District CA; Policy Analysis

ABSTRACT

This case study describes the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) Intern Program, which utilizes an alternative route to teacher certification in order to meet the teacher recruitment and training needs of a large urban multicultural school district. Findings suggest that between 1984 and 1990 the program recruited 1,100 new teachers to the district in subject shortage areas; the percentage of teachers participating in the intern program was increased and the percentage of emergency credential teachers was reduced; a significant proportion of intern teachers are predisposed to teach in an urban setting in schools with high percentages of low-income and minority students; minority teachers are recruited at a much higher rate than the percentage recruited through traditional university routes; and alternative route interns hold higher expectations for low-income and minority students than do traditional university program recruits. Though not considered a replacement for college-based teacher education, the program provides comprehensive, on-the-job professional training which is context-specific and focuses on preparing teachers to work in the Los Angeles public schools, teaching according to the practices and procedures advanced by that district. (LL)

ED343905

Policy Paper No. 91-10-1

Los Angeles Unified School District Intern Program: Recruiting and Preparing Teachers for an Urban Context

Trish Stoddart

October 1991

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Koppich

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP033737

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Policy Paper No. 91-10-1

Los Angeles Unified School District Intern Program: Recruiting and Preparing Teachers for an Urban Context

Trish Stoddart

October 1991

Trish Stoddart is a Professor of Education at the University of Utah, Salt Lake City.

This research was supported in part by the National Center for Research on Teacher Education (NCRTE), Michigan State University. The NCRTE is funded primarily by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, United States Department of Education (OERI/ED). This paper was published by Policy Analysis for California Education, PACE. PACE is funded by the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation and directed jointly by James W. Guthrie, Michael W. Kirst, and Allan R. Odden. The opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the position, policy, or endorsement of the OERI/ED or the Hewlett Foundation.

Additional copies of this paper, **PP91–10–1**, are available for **$8.00** per copy, prepaid. *(California residents add appropriate sales tax.)* **Shipping charges**: 1–2 copies = $2.00, 3–5 = $3.00, 6–10 = $5.00, 10+ = $7.00. Prices are subject to change. Please request PACE Order Forms for updated prices of all publications. Mail all orders and inquiries to:

PACE
School of Education
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720

CHECKS PAYABLE TO THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Policy Paper No. PP91-10-1
Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE)
Berkeley, California
October 1991

This publication was produced with Apple Macintosh IIcx computers and an Apple LaserWriter IIntx printer. The equipment was donated to PACE by Apple Computer, Inc.

CONTENTS

	Page
Executive Summary	v
Policy Analysis for California Education	vii
Background	1
Localized Teacher Shortages	2
Emergency Certificate and Misassigned Teachers	3
Teacher Supply and Demand in California	4
Alternative Certification as a Response to Teacher Shortages	5
The LAUSD Intern Program: A Case Study	6
Method	7
Findings	8
Teacher Recruitment	8
Subject Matter Preparation	9
Attrition	11
Why Interns Chose an Alternate Route to Teacher Certification	12
How Interns Compare to College-Based Teacher Education Candidates	12
Age and Prior Work Experience	12
Gender	14
Ethnicity	14
Dispositions Towards Teaching in Urban Schools	15
Training and Support	16
The Training is District-Specific	20
Pre-Service Training	20
The Year-round Training	21
Multicultural Education	22
Mentoring	23
Criteria for Successfully Completing the Program	24
Comparisons of :LAUSD Interns with University-Educated Teachers	25
Discussion	28
Conclusions	29

Executive Summary

For at least twenty years traditional approaches to teacher recruitment have not provided sufficient numbers of teachers to meet the needs of urban areas or for high-demand subject areas such as mathematics, science, bilingual education, and special education. Supporters of alternative routes to teacher certification argue that these programs are an effective way to recruit academically competent individuals to teach in hard-to-staff schools and to allow school districts to replace the emergency credential system with a rigorous program of field-based professional training. Critics of alternative certification argue that such programs are "quick fix" solutions to teacher shortages, an approach which recruits substandard teachers, provides inadequate professional education, and results in a decline in the quality of instruction in the public schools.

There is currently little information available on the outcomes of such alternative approaches to teacher recruitment and training. This paper uses a case study of one program, the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) Intern Program, to investigate the use of an alternative route to teacher certification to meet the teacher recruitment and training needs of a large urban multicultural school district. It addresses four main questions: (1) How effective is an alternative route to teacher certification in recruiting academically qualified individuals to teach in urban schools? (2) Does the population of teacher candidates recruited into the alternative route program differ from the traditional college-based teacher education population? (3) What kind of professional education is provided by an alternative route to teacher certification? and (4) How do teachers in the alternative route program compare to university-educated teachers?

Among the findings of the study are the following:

1. Between 1984 and 1990, the LAUSD Intern Program recruited 1,100 new teachers to the district in subject shortage areas—103 bilingual teachers, 316 elementary teachers, 240 English teachers, 184 math teachers, and 257 science teachers.

2. The district increased the percentage of teachers participating in the intern program and reduced the percentage of emergency credential teachers.

3. A significant proportion of intern teachers are predisposed to teach in an urban setting and at hard-to-staff inner-city schools with high percentages of low-income and minority students.

4. The LAUSD Intern Program recruits minority teachers at a much higher rate than the percentage recruited through traditional university routes. Since the program's inception, nearly one-third of the teachers recruited through the intern program are members of minority groups—12 percent Hispanic, 9 percent black, 6 percent Asian, and 2 percent American Indian, Filipino, or Pacific Islander.

5. Alternative route interns hold higher expectations for low-income and minority students than do traditional university program recruits.

The research also found that the intern program provides comprehensive, on-the-job professional training which is context specific. In other words, the alternative route program focuses on preparing teachers to work in the Los Angeles public schools and to teach according to the practices and procedures advanced by that district. The study cautions that California's alternative route program is not a replacement for college-based teacher education. Rather, it is a context-specific recruitment policy for the Los Angeles Unified School District.

Policy Analysis for California Education

Policy Analysis for California Education, PACE, is a university-based research center focusing on issues of state educational policy and practice. PACE is located in the Schools of Education at the University of California at Berkeley, Stanford University, and the University of Southern California. It is funded by the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation and co-directed by James W. Guthrie, Michael W. Kirst, and Allan R. Odden. PACE operates a satellite center in Sacramento.

PACE efforts center on five tasks: (1) collecting and distributing objective information about the conditions of education in California, (2) analyzing state educational policy issues and the policy environment, (3) evaluating school reforms and state educational practices, (4) providing technical support to policy makers, and (5) facilitating discussion of educational issues.

The PACE research agenda is developed in consultation with public officials and staff. In this way, PACE endeavors to address policy issues of immediate concern and to fill the short-term needs of decision makers for information and analysis.

PACE publications include Policy Papers, which report research findings; the Policy Forum, which presents views of notable individuals; and Update, an annotated list of all PACE papers completed and in progress.

Advisory Board

Joseph Alibrandi
Chief Executive Officer,
The Whittaker Corporation

Warren Bennis
Distinguished Professor
of Business Administration,
University of Southern California

Mario Camara
Partner,
Cox, Castle & Nicholson

Gerald C. Hayward
Deputy Director,
National Center for Research
in Vocational Education

Cornell Maier
Chairman/CEO (Retired)
Kaiser Aluminum and
Chemical Corporation

Robert Maynard
Editor and President,
The Oakland Tribune

A. Alan Post
California Legislative Analyst
Retired

Sharon Schuster
President, American Association
of University Women

Floraline Stevens
Director, Program Evaluation and
Assessment
Los Angeles Unified School District

Eugene Webb
Professor
Graduate School of Business
Stanford University

Aaron Wildavsky
Professor of Political Science
University of California, Berkeley

BACKGROUND

Alternative routes into teaching have been widely criticized by the teacher education community as "quick fix" solutions to teacher shortages, an approach which recruits substandard teachers, provides inadequate professional education, and results in a decline in the quality of instruction in the public schools.[1] Paradoxically, such programs often represent an attempt on behalf of states and school districts to upgrade teaching standards already downgraded by teaching shortages that result in the use of emergency credentialed and misassigned teachers.[2] For at least twenty years traditional approaches to teacher recruitment have not provided sufficient numbers of teachers to meet the needs of urban areas or for high-demand subject areas such as mathematics, science, bilingual education, and special education.[3] A whole generation of children, particularly those from inner-city and minority families, is already being educated by marginally qualified teachers. Supporters of alternative routes to teacher certification argue that these programs are an effective way to recruit academically competent individuals to teach in hard-to-staff schools[4] and to allow school districts to replace the emergency credential system with a rigorous program of field-based professional training.[5]

Clearly, strategies need to be developed to attract talented individuals to teach in urban schools. The quality of instruction in urban schools, however, will not improve if the individuals who enter teaching through alternative routes are not academically competent and do not receive high quality professional education. While most states have established minimum academic standards for admission to alternative route programs—typically an individual must have completed a bachelors degree with at least a C+ college grade average and pass a basic skills and subject specialty area test—the quantity and quality of professional education provided by such programs varies widely.[6] Some programs grant full certification based on transcript and resumé analysis while others require individuals to complete the equivalent of a traditional approved college teacher preparation program.

There is currently little information available on the outcomes of such alternative approaches to teacher recruitment and training. This paper uses a case study of one program, the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) Intern Program, to investigate the use of an alternative route to teacher certification to meet the teacher recruitment and training needs of a large urban multicultural school district. It addresses four main questions: (1) How effective is an alternative route to teacher certification in recruiting academically qualified individuals to teach in urban schools? (2) Does the population of teacher candidates recruited into the alternative route program differ from the traditional college-based teacher education population? (3) What kind of professional education is provided by an alternative route to teacher certification? and (4) How do teachers in the alternative route program compare to university-educated teachers?

Localized Teacher Shortages

Projections on teacher supply and demand over the last decade indicate that the United States could face a teacher shortage unless recruitment into teacher education programs increases or alternative sources of teachers are found.[7] Increased student enrollment, a high rate of teacher attrition, an aging teaching force, and new opportunities for minorities and women in more lucrative professions are all factors that contribute to teacher shortages.[8] Recent estimates indicate that over the next five years more than a million new teachers will need to be hired.[9] The situation is complicated by the fact that teacher shortages tend to be located in specific subject matter areas, grade levels, and geographical contexts. Many of these new teachers will be needed in urban schools and in high-demand subject areas such as mathematics and science. Even when more teachers are recruited, there is no guarantee they will meet specific recruitment needs.

The traditional source of new teachers has been undergraduate college students who decide as sophomores to become teachers. The 18- to 21-year-old cohort that forms the traditional college-age population is declining and a smaller proportion of this cohort is entering teacher education. Between 1975 and 1984, the percentage of college students majoring in education declined from 21 percent to 9 percent and the number of newly qualified teachers dropped by more than 50 percent—from 261,000 to 105,000.[10] While in recent years there has been an upswing in recruitment into teacher education programs,[11] the increase is not sufficient to meet demand. It has been estimated that, by 1992, the supply of new teachers may constitute less than two-thirds of the number needed.[12]

This situation has led to the development of general policies that aim to improve recruitment by making the teaching profession more attractive—for example, raising beginning teacher salaries, and instituting loan forgiveness programs and career ladders. General policies, however, ignore the fact that many teacher shortages are localized in specific geographical contexts, subject matter areas, and grade levels. Raising the beginning teacher salary across the board may encourage a new graduate to train to teach history in a suburban secondary school but is unlikely to encourage a new math or science graduate to consider a career as a teacher in an inner-city school.

The inner cities have, and in the foreseeable future will continue to have, chronic shortages in all fields and at all levels. The typical teacher education graduate prefers to teach in a suburban rather than urban school.[13] In every state the urban areas rely on uncertified or misassigned teachers, whereas neighboring suburbs have up to 500 applicants for each job.[14]

This, a serious problem in itself, is exacerbated by a decline in the number of minorities entering teaching. The importance of teachers as role models for children has long been recognized, especially when the teacher is a member of the students' own cultural group.[15] Increased opportunities for minorities in more lucrative and higher prestige occupations have resulted in a dwindling supply of minority teachers.[16] Projections based on current trends show

that minorities will constitute only 5 percent of the teaching force by the year 2000 while the minority student population will expand from 29 percent to 33 percent.[17] The shortage of teachers of color is of particular concern in states such as California which are predicted to have a "majority-minority" population by the year 2000 and where school districts such as Los Angeles Unified already have child populations that are more than 70 percent minority.[18]

High demand for, and high salaries paid to, the small number of skilled math and science professionals by business and industry indicate there will be a continuing and growing shortage of math and science teachers.[19]. The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics reported a 77 percent decline between 1972–1982 in the number of secondary-level mathematics teachers enrolled in 600 teacher training programs nationwide.[20] In the same period, the number of degrees granted in science education declined by one-third.[21] Teacher shortages in mathematics and science have been acute for at least two decades[22] and almost two-thirds of the states report long-term teacher shortages in these disciplines.[23]

Emergency Certificate and Misassigned Teachers

In most states the response to teacher shortages has been to issue emergency certificates or use out-of-field teachers to fill gaps in staffing.[24] Forty-six of fifty states permit the issuing of substandard, limited, or emergency certificates.[25] An emergency certificate allows someone to teach who either does not have academic qualifications in the subject to be taught or does not have a teaching credential. In at least twenty of the forty-six states, emergency certificates are issued to candidates who do not have a bachelor's degree.[26] In 1986–87, 22 percent of newly hired teachers were not endorsed for the subject or grade level they were assigned to teach.[27]

Hiring new teachers on emergency credentials is only part of the problem. In most states, teachers who have taught in the school system for one year can be reassigned to any subject without violating teacher certification laws. Thus it would be legal to reassign an English teacher to teach chemistry or a math teacher to teach biology. The Council of Basic Education (CBE) and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) surveyed the fifty states in 1983 and estimated that as many as 200,000 U.S. teachers—approximately 10 percent of the total—were teaching out of field.[28] The percentages are higher for newly qualified teachers. In April 1987, only 74 percent of newly qualified teachers who were teaching were certified in their teaching field.[29]

As would be expected these percentages are significantly higher in urban areas and in high-demand subjects. According to one researcher, three-quarters of the 4,600 new teachers hired in New York City Public Schools in 1989 were not fully certified to teach.[30] In 1987, nearly half of the newly qualified teachers were not certified to teach in their assigned fields—mathematics, 50 percent; biological science, 47 percent; and physical science, 31 percent.[31]

Teacher Supply and Demand in California

Teacher recruitment in California is a microcosm of the national situation. By 1995, California's student population is expected to increase by 900,000 due to increases in both the birth rate and immigration. At the same time, an estimated 25,000 to 60,000 teachers will retire, and an expected 35,000 to 65,000 teachers will leave education for the private sector.[32] In the next decade, therefore, California will need to recruit, depending on estimates, between 90,000 and 190,000 additional teachers.[33] Using conservative estimates of the state's ability to train new instructors, to attract out-of-state professionals to California, and to induce reserve-pool teachers to re-enter the profession, a possible shortfall of between 21,300 and 34,800 teachers is forecast by 1990.[34]

Large numbers of these new teachers will be needed in the urban areas of southern California. Schools in the Los Angeles metropolitan area alone are adding students at the rate of 14,000 a year.[35] Unfortunately, these urban schools have the most difficulty in recruiting and retaining teachers. Los Angeles Unified School District reportedly accounts for more than half the teacher shortages in the western region and one-fourth of all the shortages in the nation.

School districts in southern California rely disproportionately on emergency credential or out-of-field teachers to fill gaps in staffing. The California Basic Educational Data System (CBEDS) shows that in 1985–86 (the latest year for which data are available), emergency credentials represented 20 percent of all first-issue and added credentials in California.[36] In 1985–86, and for each of the five consecutive years, 40 to 45 percent of all new teachers hired by LAUSD were on emergency credentials.[37]

A PACE analysis of CBEDS data for 1985–86 indicates that 12 percent of California teachers were instructing outside of the field for which they were certified (PACE, 1988). The number of classes taught by inappropriately credentialed teachers is largest in the areas of bilingual education (60% of percent of classes taught by misassigned teachers), followed by mathematics (26%), social science (21%), science (21%), and English (15%). In California high schools during the 1985–86 school year, 36,652 math classes and 29,302 science classes (between 18% and 30%, depending on type of class) were taught by teachers with emergency certificates.[38] This means in one year alone approximately 1,900,000 California high school students were instructed in math and science by teachers who were not certified to teach these subjects.

Once again the effects of the teacher shortage are particularly obvious in southern California where a disproportionately high number of teachers are inadequately qualified in the subjects they teach. Three adjacent counties in the Los Angeles Basin—Los Angeles, Orange, and San Diego—employed 53 percent of inappropriately credentialed California math teachers and 54 percent of inappropriately qualified science teachers.[39]

Southern California has a particular need for bilingual teachers. The number of limited-English-proficient (LEP) students in California public schools has nearly tripled over the past decade—from about 230,000 to approximately 600,000 in 1987, or about 13 percent of the student population.[40] The majority of these students—67.6 percent—attended school in nine southern counties. Los Angeles County alone enrolled more than 240,000 LEP students, accounting for 46 percent of the statewide total. More than one-third of the bilingual credentials issued in 1985–86 (32.4%) were emergency certificates, up more than 6 percent from 1984–85. Sixty percent of the teachers who are teaching classes designated by school districts as "bilingual" do not possess bilingual credentials.[41]

There is little hope of recruiting sufficient teachers to meet southern California's need through traditional sources of teacher supply. Overall enrollment in basic teaching credential programs declined by 1,228 (5%) from 1984–85 to 1985–86 and by 6,280 (32%) from 1985–86 to 1986–87.[42] In 1986–87, the majority of these new teachers were white—minorities represent only about 13 percent of candidates recommended for credentialing by California State University System (CSU) which trains approximately 70 percent of teachers hired in California.[43] Traditional approaches to teacher recruitment and training are unlikely to reverse this trend. A recent survey indicates that many California teacher education institutions, in an attempt to raise academic standards, are limiting enrollments by reducing or capping the number of students admitted into the program or into student teaching.[44] In areas where California teacher education institutions have been successful in increasing enrollments, these increases are not sufficient to meet demand; there are still more emergency credentials than first credentials of other types being issued.[45]

Alternative Certification as a Response to Teacher Shortages

Proponents of alternative routes to teacher certification have argued that an appropriate response to the teacher shortage would be to restructure teacher certification regulations to expand the recruitment population beyond the traditional teacher education cohort and make entry into teaching easy for individuals at other ages and stages in their careers. Early in the decade, several national reports included recommendations aimed at attracting outside experts into mathematics and science teaching.[46] These reports suggested that having qualified scientists and mathematicians assist in developing and delivering instruction would improve school instructional programs. Others have suggested that eased entry into teaching should be provided for mature individuals willing to transfer into teaching from other professions. These recruits might include early retirees, including technical experts from the armed services, homemakers who wish to re-enter the work force and bright young graduates of the arts and sciences who are undecided about their career direction and are willing to devote a few years to teaching.[47]

Another perspective has been offered which argues that in order to recruit large numbers of individuals willing to and capable of teaching in difficult school environments—particularly urban areas with diverse student populations—a different type of individual needs to be recruited into teaching.[48] The traditional route into teaching has been through the undergraduate major. As a consequence, about 70 percent of newly qualified teacher are under 25 years of age.[49] The argument for recruiting a greater number of mature individuals into teaching is that college-age students, still in the stages of late adolescence and early adulthood, are not developmentally mature enough to teach in difficult environments.[50]

Under traditional certification standards, potential teachers in all these groups would have to complete professional education college coursework before they could be granted a teaching credential and be allowed to assume full-time paid teaching jobs.[51] Proponents of alternative routes to teacher certification believe that most of these individuals would be unwilling to take college-based coursework or assume the educational costs of becoming a teacher. Alternative routes to teacher certification, therefore, allow individuals to earn a teaching credential while they work and are paid as full-time teachers. Such routes reduce the time and financial costs of entry into teaching.[52]

Although alternative routes to teacher certification usually do not require college-based teacher education, most do provide some form of professional education.[53] It has been argued that this on-the-job teacher education is a significant improvement over the emergency credential system which allows unqualified individuals to teach with no formal system of guidance or support.[54]

The LAUSD Intern Program: A Case Study

The preceding review of research indicates traditional methods of teacher recruitment have been unable to deal effectively with the staffing needs of many urban school districts. In 1983, in response to growing concerns about the chronic teacher shortage in the urban districts of southern California, the California state legislature included a teacher-trainee provision as part of the Hughes-Hart Education Reform Bill (Senate Bill 813). This regulation allowed school districts which can verify teacher shortages to hire uncertified individuals as secondary school teachers and to offer a training program through which they can become licensed. The individual to be appointed must have a baccalaureate degree with 20 units in a subject matter major, pass a state-approved exam in the subject area to be taught, and pass the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST). Participating school districts must create and implement a two- to three-year program of professional training and provide the intern with support by a mentor teacher.

In developing the program, the school district is required to consult with an accredited institution of higher education but is not legally mandated to implement recommendations offered by the institution. The school district must submit its professional development plan to the

Commission on Teacher Credentialing for verification. In 1987, Assembly Bill 1728 authorized expansion of the program to include elementary and bilingual teachers and renamed it the District Intern Program. In 1988, the Bergeson Act (Senate Bill 148) made it more difficult for school districts to hire emergency credential teachers, requiring that they focus on recruiting certified teachers and teacher candidates pursuing full certification through the District Intern Program.

In 1984, LAUSD instituted a District Intern Program (originally called the Teacher Trainee Program) designed to recruit academically competent individuals in areas of subject matter shortage to teach in hard-to-staff schools.[55] Originally developed to recruit secondary English, mathematics, and science teachers in 1988, the program was extended to include elementary and bilingual education teachers. Since 1984, LAUSD has recruited and trained 1,100 novice teachers—approximately 96 percent of the alternative route candidates trained in California.[56]

The second half of this paper uses the Los Angeles Unified School District Intern Program as a case study to examine the use of an alternative route to teacher certification as a context-specific teacher recruitment and training policy. It addresses four main questions: (1) How effective is the LAUSD Intern Program in meeting the district's teacher recruitment needs? (2) What kind of individuals does the program recruit and how do they differ from the traditional teacher education population? (3) What kind of professional education does the LAUSD program provide? and (4) How do alternative-route teachers compare to university-educated teachers?

METHOD

The analyses reported in this paper are based on two sources of data: (1) demographic data supplied by the LAUSD Personnel Division, and (2) data drawn from the "Teacher Education and Learning to Teach" study (TELT) of the National Center for Research on Teacher Education (NCRTE) at Michigan State University.[57] To analyze the success of the LAUSD intern program in recruiting teacher candidates to meet the district's needs, demographic statistics provided by LAUSD Personnel Divisions, for the years 1984–1990, were used to examine intern recruitment patterns, attrition rates, academic qualifications, school assignments, and background characteristics. To provide a context for evaluating these recruitment trends, comparison statistics are cited, when available, from the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education RATE III study[58] and the National Center for Educational Statistics data on newly qualified teachers.[59] NCRTE interviews with the program director, instructors, and mentor teachers, and tape recordings of a sample of teacher education classes were used to evaluate the focus and content of the program.

FINDINGS

Teacher Recruitment

One of the main goals of the LAUSD program is to recruit academically competent individuals to teach in its hard-to-staff schools. As Table 1 shows, the LAUSD District Intern Program has recruited 1,100 new teachers into the district in the last six years—103 bilingual teachers, 316 elementary teachers, 240 English teachers, 184 math teachers, and 257 science teachers. Eight hundred and fifty-five of these recruits, about 70 percent, are still teaching in the district. The intern program now trains about 300 new teachers a year. This number is equivalent to one of the smaller California State University (CSU) campuses.[60]

TABLE 1 Number of Teachers Trained by LAUSD by Subject Area and Level of Teaching

Cohort	English	Math	Science	Elementary	Bilingual Elementary	Total
I (1984–85)	93	30	64	0	0	187
II (1985–86)	36	32	63	0	0	131
III (1986–87)	46	33	38	0	0	117
IV (1987–88)	19	37	36	0	0	92
V (1988–89)	20	29	33	105	56	243
VI (1989–90)	26	23	23	211	47	330
Totals	240	184	257	316	103	1,100

Another main goal of the program is to reduce the number of marginally qualified emergency credential teachers working in the district. Among all new LAUSD teachers recruited, the percentage in the intern program increased from 3.7 percent in 1987–1988 to 11.4 percent in 1989–90. During the same period the percentage of new teachers who had emergency credentials decreased from 47 percent to 34 percent. The percentage of college-trained teachers entering the district with a clear teaching credential, however, remained constant—between 34 and 36 percent.

The District Intern Program appears to be serving its purpose by decreasing the proportion of emergency-credential teachers entering the district's schools. It is not, however, adversely affecting the recruitment of college-trained teachers.

Another of the program's goals is to recruit competent teachers who are willing to work in hard-to-staff schools. An increasing number of interns are teaching in the district's "priority staff program" (PSP) schools—which are hard-to-staff inner-city schools with high proportions of low-income and minority students. The proportion of all new teachers in PSP schools who were district interns increased from 5.3 percent in 1987–88 to 18.5 percent in 1989–90. In the same period the proportion of emergency-credential teachers hired into PSP schools declined from 43 percent to 32 percent

LAUSD has high recruitment needs for teachers in mathematics, science, and bilingual education, subject areas in which there are chronic national shortages.[61] Between 1984 and 1990, the intern program recruited 184 mathematics teachers (between 15% and 34% of its recruitment needs per year) and 257 science teachers (between 17% and 31% of its recruitment needs per year). This was a remarkable achievement considering that in the same period it has been estimated that the universities and colleges were producing less than one new math or science graduate for every ten school districts in the United States.[62] In 1984, 775 students graduated nationally with a degree in mathematics education, 103 from California institutions. In the same year, LAUSD began training 30 new math teachers, about 4 percent of the national figure and 16 percent of the California figure. Also in 1984, 702 science education majors graduated nationally, 191 of them from California institutions. In 1984–85, LAUSD began training 64 new science teachers or approximately 9 percent of national production and 34 percent of California production.[63]

In 1988, to fill its need for bilingual teachers in elementary schools—about 60 percent of students in kindergarten and first grade came from homes where English was not the primary language—LAUSD began to recruit bilingual elementary education teachers into the intern program. In 1988–89 and 1989–90, respectively, 17 percent and 25 percent of new elementary bilingual teachers were recruited through the intern program.

These figures suggest that district-run alternative certification programs can recruit candidates in high-demand subject areas to teach in hard-to-staff urban schools and reduce the need to hire teachers on emergency credentials.

Subject Matter Preparation

The LAUSD Intern Program is recruiting individuals to teach in hard-to-staff schools, but are these recruits academically competent? In recent years there has been an increasing focus in teacher education policy and research on the subject matter preparation of teachers. Reform groups such as the Holmes Group[64] and the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession[65] emphasize the

pivotal role of subject matter knowledge in teaching and argue for increased emphasis on subject matter preparation. This focus on the content knowledge of teachers follows a decade of concern about teachers' general academic competence. A number of studies concluded that teaching tends to attract students of low academic ability and fails to attract substantial numbers of academically gifted students.[66] The Holmes Group, a major university-based reform group in teacher education, has proposed that a baccalaureate degree with general liberal arts education and subject matter specialization should be a prerequisite for entering teacher education.[67]

To examine the subject matter preparation of LAUSD interns, an analysis was conducted of the academic transcripts of the 92 secondary English, mathematics, and science interns who entered the program in the fall of 1987. Three variables were used to assess subject matter preparation: the number of courses taken in the academic major, the GPA in the academic major, and the institution attended.

In order to be admitted to the intern program, all candidates must have a baccalaureate degree with an academic major. In addition, secondary interns must have completed 20 semester or 30 quarter units in the subject area to be taught. The majority of LAUSD secondary interns have substantial preparation in the academic disciplines they teach. Fifty-two percent of mathematics interns, 83 percent of English interns, and 84 percent of science interns have completed at least twice that number of units in the academic subjects they are teaching. Approximately 60 percent of these courses were taken at the upper division level and about one quarter were graduate courses. To ensure that this subject matter knowledge is current, secondary interns must also pass the National Teacher Exam (NTE) in the content area they teach: the passing score for English is 620, mathematics 630, biological science 680, and physical science 630.

Academic transcripts were not available for elementary interns (who were not part of the NCTE study), but each must have a baccalaureate degree with any academic major (the general liberal arts education recommended by the Holmes Group), and with college-level coursework in eight of the following ten subject areas—language studies, literature, history, social sciences, mathematics, sciences, humanities, visual/performing arts, physical education, and human development. They must also pass the NTE general knowledge exam with a score of 660. In contrast, 75 percent of newly qualified elementary and secondary school teachers who graduated in 1986 majored in education—not in an academic discipline.[68]

The GPAs of the secondary interns compare favorably to those of the college-based teacher education population. Sixty-five percent of science interns, 61 percent of English interns, and 39 percent of mathematics interns have GPAs of 3.25 or higher on a four-point scale in their subject area specialty and only 9 percent of interns have GPAs below 2.75. Statistics for teachers who qualified in 1987 show that 48 percent had GPAs of 3.25 or higher and 14.5 percent had GPAs below 2.75.[69] The higher proportion of lower achieving math interns is probably related to California's highly competitive job market for graduates in mathematics.[70]

Finally, analysis of subject matter preparation can be examined in relationship to the degree-granting institution, since student populations, grading practices, and rigor of the curriculum vary widely among schools. The majority of the secondary interns graduated from academically rigorous institutions. Forty-five percent of these interns attended University of California campuses which select from the top 10 percent of the high school graduating class, and 28 percent attended other institutions with comparable academic standards. The remaining 27 percent graduated from California State University campuses which recruit from the top 40 percent of high school seniors.

Attrition

The LAUSD Intern Program appears to be making a significant contribution in recruiting academically able individuals to teach in hard-to-staff inner-city schools. But will they remain in teaching? Nationally, the attrition rate among newly prepared and beginning teachers appears to be high. A recent NCES[71] survey reports that only 61 percent of newly qualified teachers who received their degrees in 1985–86 were teaching in April 1987. The most recent data available on attrition in the first three years of teaching indicates that 40 percent of the cohort of teachers who entered the profession in the late 1970s have since left teaching.[72] Given that many of the LAUSD interns are placed in difficult-to-staff PSP schools and hold qualifications which would enable them easily to obtain other jobs, the LAUSD intern attrition rate might be expected to be high. As Table 2 shows, the attrition rate for cohorts of LAUSD interns in the first three years of teaching is lower than would be expected on the basis of national figures: only 18 percent of cohort IV

TABLE 2 LAUSD District Intern Attrition Rates

		Active	Inactive	% of Attrition
Cohort I	1984–85	88	99	53%
Cohort II	1985–86	68	63	48%
Cohort III	1986–87	76	41	35%
Cohort IV	1987–88	75	17	18%
Cohort V	1988–89	225	18	7%
Cohort VI	1989–90	323	7	2%
TOTAL		**855**	**245**	**29%**

interns, who entered the program and began teaching in 1987, have left the profession. The figures from cohorts I, II, and III indicate the rate of attrition from LAUSD increases after the third year of teaching. Of the first cohort, who entered teaching in 1984 and have been teaching for six years, only 53 percent are still working in the LAUSD public schools. It is unclear how many of the interns who resigned from LAUSD left the teaching profession. Of 245 interns who resigned between 1984 and 1989, 46 indicated they were leaving the profession, 43 indicated they were moving to another teaching position, and the rest cited family or personal reasons or did not specify.[73]

Two factors may influence the relatively low intern attrition rates in the first two years of teaching: (1) LAUSD interns are enrolled in a program which provides both support from a mentor teacher and weekly teacher education seminars, while most beginning teachers receive little support, and (2) interns must successfully complete two years of full-time teaching in order to receive their teaching credential.

Why Interns Chose an Alternative Route to Teacher Certification

When asked why they chose to enter the LAUSD program rather than enrolling in a college-based teacher education program, interns gave three main responses: (1) financial need, (2) the belief that one could learn to teach more effectively by practical experience, and (3) reluctance to take more university coursework. Sixty-four percent of interns said they chose the alternative route program for financial reasons—they had a family to support or they had a high debt load from financing their undergraduate education. Twenty-eight percent said they preferred learning to teach while on the job. Justifications two and three frequently were linked together; for example, "University courses are too theoretical; they don't have anything to do with doing a job. I think I can learn more by getting out there and doing it" (secondary science intern). The remaining eight percent gave idiosyncratic answers such as "it was there" or "my mom's a teacher." These data indicate that many of these new recruits to teaching would not or could not have entered teaching through the traditional college-based route.

How Interns Compare to College-Based Teacher Education Candidates

Age and Prior Work Experience

One of the arguments in favor of alternative routes into teaching is that such programs could change the demographics of the teacher pool. Older individuals, it has been suggested, bring greater maturity and resilience to the teaching situation along with the accumulated expertise they have acquired in the work place, and are more likely to cope in difficult teaching environments.[74] LAUSD elementary and secondary interns tend to be older than the general teacher education

population, with about two-thirds of the interns being twenty-six years or older and almost a third over thirty-five years of age. In 1987, only 29 percent of newly qualified teachers were older than twenty-six years.[75]

NCRTE researchers collected data on the prior work experiences of secondary interns who enrolled in the program in 1987–1988 and 1988–89. As would be expected from the age distribution, many of the LAUSD interns have transferred into teaching from other occupations. Table 3 shows the percentage of these secondary interns in three categories of prior work experience: (1) those who had not held a full-time job and entered teaching straight from school or college, (2) those who had worked in an occupation related to the subject they are teaching (for example, English—copywriter, secretary, journalist; mathematics—engineer, accountant, surveyor; science—researcher, laboratory technician, marine biologist, forest service), and (3) those who had worked in occupations unrelated to what they are teaching (e.g. musician, salesman, truck driver, substance abuse counselor). Overall, 58 percent of secondary interns had transferred from other professions. Mathematics candidates were least likely to have transferred from another profession—53 percent of math interns entered teaching directly from college. The science interns were most likely to have transferred from another profession and to have worked in a job related to the discipline they teach. Data are not available for the elementary interns who were not part of the NCRTE study.

TABLE 3 Percentage of Secondary Interns in Three Categories of Full-time Work Experience

	Straight from College	Work Experiences in Field Related to Academic Discipline Taught	Unrelated Work Experience
English (n=36)	44%	11%	45%
Mathematics (n=61)	53%	22%	45%
Science (n=63)	28%	44%	28%

Although LAUSD interns tend to be older and are more likely to have transferred into teaching from other professions than the traditional teacher education candidates, few have worked in jobs related to the subjects they are teaching. Only 11 percent of English interns, 22 percent of mathematics interns, and 44 percent of science interns had relevant prior work experience. The relatively

high number of interns transferring into teaching from science professions—more than one hundred over six years—is encouraging. Over the past twenty years, experienced scientists have rarely entered teaching. Of 21,423 respondents employed in scientific and technical occupations in 1970, no more than 121 (about 0.5%) switched to pre-college teaching during the course of the decade.[76] Moreover, most of these did not stay in teaching for more than one or two years. Only three of these 121 appear to have worked as teachers over the entire decade. Analysis of NSF data from the 1980s indicates only 0.2 percent entered the teaching profession.

Gender

The college-based teacher education population is predominantly white and female.[77] The LAUSD Intern Program recruits a greater number of men than the typical college-based teacher education program. During the period 1984–89, 60 percent of LAUSD interns were male compared to about 30 percent of newly qualified teachers.[78] Of particular interest is the number of males recruited into elementary education—40 percent of elementary interns are male compared to only 7 percent of elementary teacher education candidates.[79]

Ethnicity

The percentage of minority teachers in U.S. schools is declining at the same time the proportion of minority students is increasing. In 1987, about 13 percent of all American teachers were members of minority groups.[80] In the same year, approximately 12 percent of newly qualified teachers were from minority groups—5 percent Hispanic, 5 percent black, 1 percent Asian, and 0.6 percent American Indian.[81] In 1988, only 8 percent of teacher education students enrolled in a nationally representative sample of college programs were minorities.[82] In the same period the LAUSD intern program was recruiting minority teachers at a much higher rate than the percentage recruited through traditional university routes. Over the six years since the program's inception, almost one-third (307 out of 1,100) of the teachers recruited through the intern program have been from minority groups—12 percent were Hispanic, 9 percent black, 6 percent Asian, and the remaining 2 percent American Indian, Filipino, or Pacific Islander. It was further found that teachers recruited through alternative route programs were more likely to be from minority groups.[83]

It could be argued that this comparatively high recruitment rate for minorities is a function of California's ethnic diversity. California is the most racially and ethnically diverse state in the country—about half the population comes from minority groups.[84] The LAUSD Intern Program, however, recruits minorities at a much higher rate than the California State University System (CSU) which prepares 70 percent of teachers in California.[85] The most recent figures from the CSU show that in 1986–87, about 13 percent of teachers recommended for credentialing from that

institution were from minority groups—2.2 percent Asian, 1.9 percent black, 7.2 percent Hispanic and 1.6 percent other.

The program also has a good retention rate for minority teachers. Of the 307 minority interns recruited by the district, 266 are still teaching in LAUSD—an overall retention rate of 87 percent, compared to 74 percent for white interns.

Dispositions Towards Teaching in Urban Schools

A prevailing problem in urban education is the recruitment of qualified teachers willing to teach in urban schools. In every state, the urban areas rely on uncertified or misassigned teachers, while neighboring suburbs have up to 500 applicants for each job.[86] The typical college teacher education graduate prefers to teach in a suburban rather than an urban school. The data presented above demonstrate that the population recruited into the LAUSD alternative route program differs from the traditional teacher education pool on several demographic dimensions—they are older, more likely to be male, to be persons of color, and to have transferred from other occupations. They also differ on their prior experience with and dispositions towards teaching in urban schools.

LAUSD elementary and secondary interns have more experience living and working in urban environments than the typical teacher education graduate. Seventy percent of LAUSD interns grew up and attended school in a city, compared to only 22 percent of teacher education students in the Research About Teacher Education III (RATE III) national survey for teacher education programs.[87] Also, a large percentage of the interns are positively disposed towards teaching in urban schools. About 70 percent of interns, compared to only 18 percent of the RATE III teacher education students, say they would prefer to teach in an urban school. The majority of the teacher education students want to teach in suburban neighborhoods or small towns.[88]

The LAUSD interns also hold higher expectations for low-income and minority students when compared to a NCRTE national sample of college-educated candidates enrolled in traditional teacher education programs. Ninety-five percent of elementary interns, 95 percent of secondary English interns, and 81 percent of secondary mathematics interns believe that low-income and minority students are capable of learning higher order concepts in the subject areas they teach. In contrast, only 76 percent of elementary teacher education candidates, 70 percent of English teacher education candidates, and 60 percent of mathematics teacher candidates held the same expectations. At least one-third of the traditional teacher education candidates believed these students should be taught only basic skills in reading, writing, grammar, and arithmetic.

These findings are not surprising given that LAUSD interns are "self-selected"—they have chosen to live and work in a large multi-cultural city. In many cases, the students they work with come from backgrounds similar to their own and interns can identify with the students.[89] In contrast, typical teacher education graduates grow up in small towns or suburbs and choose to

work close to home.[90] They are not familiar with urban schools or diverse student populations, and often find it difficult to relate to students they view as different from themselves.[91] LAUSD interns also tend to be older and come into teaching with a wide range of life experiences. It has been argued that maturity makes it easier for teachers to relate to students who are different from themselves.[92]

The LAUSD Intern Program is recruiting and retaining academically competent teachers in subject shortage areas to teach in hard-to-staff inner city schools. Many of these teachers bring with them positive dispositions towards teaching in urban schools, dispositions not commonly found in the traditional teacher education population. Recruitment is only the first step, however, in professional development. A discussion of the structure and content of the professional education provided by the LAUSD program follows.

Training and Support

Critics of alternative routes to teacher licensure have cautioned that such programs may not be equivalent in substance and rigor to college-based programs of teacher education.[93] The basic structure of the LAUSD Intern Program, however, is similar to that of a California college-based program. The California Teacher Preparation and Licensing Act of 1970, also known as the Ryan Act, sets out the basic requirements for teaching credentials in California. As Table 4 shows, candidates in both college-based and alternative groups are required to complete a baccalaureate degree, pass a subject matter competency exam or approved coursework, pass the CBEST, and complete a program of post-baccalaureate professional training before being recommended for a teaching credential.

The amount of time spent in coursework is also equivalent to the requirements for California college-based programs. The Ryan Act requires that candidates enrolled in college-based teacher education programs must take at least nine units of professional education coursework and one semester of student teaching.[94] The majority of California teacher education institutions limit their programs to one academic year—three quarters or two semesters—including student teaching.[95] Coursework in a typical California post-baccalaureate fifth-year program, therefore, is equivalent to about 200 clock hours; coursework in the LAUSD program amounts to about 240 clock hours in the secondary program and 256 clock hours in the elementary program. This is also comparable to typical undergraduate college-based secondary education programs in which students complete 26 credit hours (260 clock hours) in professional education including student teaching, but less than the typical elementary education program where students complete an average of 50 credit hours (500 clock hours) including student teaching.[96]

TABLE 4 Comparison of Routes to Teacher Certification in California

College-Based Route	LAUSD Alternate Route
Earn a bachelor's degree from an accredited college or university	Earn a bachelor's degree from an accredited college or university
Pass the state basic skills proficiency test (CBEST)	Pass the state basic skills proficiency test (CBEST) and the NTE
Be admitted to teacher education program	Be hired as district intern by school district
Complete one year of post-graduate study consisting of supervised teaching and professional courses, including courses in reading instruction, health education, and special education	While teaching satisfactorily for two years with a mentor, complete a professional development program which is developed by the school district
Be recommended for a teaching credential by the college or university	Be recommended for a teaching credential by the school district

The focus of the coursework provided by the intern program is also similar to that provided by college programs. The professional sequence for college-based elementary teachers typically covers some sort of introduction to education; a course in educational psychology; six or seven methods courses for teaching reading, social studies, arithmetic, science, art, and music; and student teaching. For secondary teachers, it involves a course in educational psychology, a general methods course, a subject-specific methods course, and student teaching.[97] As Tables 5 and 6 show, the LAUSD Intern Program covers similar topics.

The LAUSD Intern Program, however, is not as academically rigorous as a typical college-based program. In the LAUSD program there are no formal assignments or examinations; regular class attendance is the only criterion for passing a course. The emphasis of instruction is also different. College-based programs attempt to prepare teachers who can critically analyze and reflect on a wide range of educational theory and curriculum and instructional practices.[98] The LAUSD Intern Program focuses on preparing teachers to effectively use the district's approach to curriculum and instruction.

TABLE 5 Schedule of LAUSD Elementary Intern Classes

Clock Yearly Schedule	Hours	Course Titles
Fall Semester	16	Stages of child psychological and cognitive development
	16	Curriculum and methods of teaching reading and the language arts
	16	Practice in teaching skills
Spring Semester	16	Aligning classroom organization and management with development
	16	Curriculum and methods of teaching mathematics and science
	16	English for speakers of other languages languages
	16	Practice in teaching skills
Summer	32	Multicultural education: general
Fall Semester	16	Curriculum and teaching methods of teaching social science, music, and art
	16	Multicultural education: specific
	16	practice in teaching skills
Spring Semester	16	Curriculum and methods of teaching movement, health, safety, and environmental education
	16	Overview of children with special needs
	16	Computer literacy
	16	Practice in teaching skills

TABLE 6 Schedule of LAUSD Secondary Intern Classes

Yearly Schedule	Clock Hours	Course Titles
Fall Semester	16	Classroom management in an urban setting
	16	Reading instruction in the content fields and quality skill building
	16	Practice teaching skills
Spring Semester	16	Bilingual, ESL, and other language development and instructional practices
	16	Assessing, diagnosing and reporting achievement
	16	Practice in teaching skills
Summer Five Days	32	Multicultural education: general
Fall Semester	16	How learning occurs
	16	Methods of teaching English, mathematics and science
	16	Practice in teaching skills
Spring Semester	32	Multicultural education: specific practice in teaching skills
	16	Interdisciplinary overview of children with special needs
	16	Practice in teaching skills

District interns teach full time while they participate in a two-year program developed and administered by the district's staff development personnel. The training program has four components: (1) a 15-day pre-service orientation to LAUSD's policies, procedures, and curriculum held in the two weeks before interns begin teaching, (2) two years of in-service training, which comprises 18 modules organized around the Carnegie units and taught in a two-hour after-school weekly seminar, (3) one week of multicultural education at the end of the first year of teaching, and (4) support by a mentor teacher. Interns who complete the program and receive positive evaluaions from their school principals are recommended by the school district to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing for teaching credentials.

The Training Is District-Specific

The content of the LAUSD Intern Program covers many topics that would be included in most college-based teacher preparation programs, and also includes substantial attention to areas that are specific to Los Angeles or are of special importance for teaching in inner-city schools. The program developers recognize that this approach is different from that taken by a university-based program that attempts to prepare students for the wide variety of teaching jobs graduates may undertake. As one program director stated, "That's what I think is real[ly] different, that we're district specific. So that what I notice about some university-prepared teachers is that they have to re-learn, and I think one of the side benefits [for the interns] is that they have an initial learning. One way—the way things are done in the district."

Throughout, the training is oriented toward helping teachers succeed in the LAUSD schools. Thus, for example, modules on teaching reading, mathematics, science, and so forth focus on analyzing representative objectives from the subject and grade-level-specific LAUSD *Guidelines for Instruction*[99] and planning appropriate instructional activities. All the instructors are trained in, explicitly teach, and model the "Madeline Hunter" method, which is the approach to instructional organization and delivery prescribed by the district and the basis of the district's evaluation process.

In selecting content and procedures, program developers and instructors focus on content that will help interns improve instruction to their current students. There is a strong emphasis on demonstrating instructional activities and providing lesson plans, dittos, and instructional materials for interns to use with their own classes. Courses do not typically discuss theory or research other than summaries of research—for example, instructional practices derived from the effective teaching literature.[100] A great deal of time is spent discussing the application of the material the instructor is presenting to specific incidents that have occurred in interns' classrooms. The emphasis on district curriculum and instructional practices is reinforced by the experienced teachers who teach the classes and mentor teachers who give generously of their wisdom of practice—"what works for me in my classroom."

Pre-Service Training

The fifteen days of pre-service training consist of a series of seminars and two days of observation in school. Secondary interns are grouped by subject matter specialty (English, math, or science), elementary interns into regular or bilingual groups. The training, which is explicitly focused on inducting interns into the district, was described by the program directors as a "crash course in survival skills." Analysis of transcripts of the classes offered in the three weeks of pre-service training revealed four main categories of knowledge taught in the pre-service component: (1) procedural knowledge (including the regulations and procedures of LAUSD), how to fill in a roll

book, how to make sure one gets a paycheck on time, how to get a substitute teacher if one is ill, how to report child abuse, and so forth; (2) the subject matter content prescribed by the state and LAUSD, published in curriculum guidelines that specify learning objectives for each grade level; (3) the district's approach to organizing and planning instruction based on the Madeline Hunter five-step lesson plan; and (4) survival skills—for example, how to get through the first day or week, lists of things for students to do, referred to as "sponge activities" (dittos, handouts, games) which "mop up" extra time, what to do with disruptive students, and sample lessons prepared by the *Los Angeles Times*.

Three themes permeate the pre-service training: (1) "You are now part of the LAUSD team." Instructors and personnel department staff point out the benefits of working in LAUSD and stress it should be viewed as a long-term career commitment; (2) "You will fail at first, but you will survive and become an effective teacher." Instructors provide many examples of beginning teachers, including themselves, who experience difficulties when they first begin teaching but eventually become effective teachers; and (3) "All children regardless of race, gender, or social class can learn effectively, and it is your duty as teachers to ensure that they succeed."

The Year-round Training

Throughout their two years in the program, interns attend two-hour training sessions every Thursday afternoon from 4:00 to 6:00 p.m. They can choose to attend one of three regional training centers. Over the two-year period they take a series of seminars organized around Carnegie units. Each 16-hour (eight-week) module is regarded as equivalent to one college unit (non-transferable) and earns the intern a one-point advancement towards salary.

At the beginning of each session, interns meet as a group with an intern program supervisor to discuss practical problems and issues that have come up in their teaching during the week. Interns find these weekly discussion sessions a useful way to vent frustrations, and a source of ideas for dealing with specific classroom problems. Because they spend two years as a cohort going through the weekly after-school training, interns tend to form a support group for each other which helps them deal with the stresses of teaching.

The discussion of interns' school and classroom problems which precedes each session sets the context for the class which follows. Seminars cover topics similar to those taught in college-based programs of teacher education, but they tend to focus almost exclusively on practical and immediate application in interns' classrooms rather than discussion of underlying principles or critical approaches. Interns do not usually develop curriculum and instructional methods themselves but are presented with a variety of examples they can chose to use.

A typical example of how instructors model instruction was provided in the English methods unit taught by an experienced English teacher. The course focused on teaching language arts

through literature—"teaching into, through, and beyond literature"—the approach to English education developed by the district's advisory staff. The main goal of this program is to present "integrated, interrelated" lessons where integration is defined as blending reading, writing, speaking, and analysis of literature in one unit. The classes focused on presenting practical examples of this approach, not theory or research related to the approach. For example, in one class the instructor presented a model of a unit which used a short story to achieve a variety of instructional goals. The story was read aloud by students to promote reading skills, a class discussion helped develop student comprehension and communication skills, and students were required to write a letter to one of the characters to practice writing, grammar, and punctuation skills. The instructor engaged interns in thinking about the practical aspects of teaching this unit: sequencing and timing of instruction, adapting instruction to differing student needs, and fitting in with the district's curriculum and testing guidelines.

Multicultural Education

In line with the program's emphasis on teaching in the context of the LAUSD schools, there is a strong focus on multicultural education. Approximately 40 percent of time spent on coursework is devoted to this topic, including two courses and a "Multicultural Week" at the end of interns' first year of teaching. The LAUSD Intern Program assigns significantly more instructional time to multicultural education than is required by the state credentialing regulations for college-based programs. In California, college-based programs are required to include an emphasis on cultural diversity and the education of children whose primary language is other than English, but are not required to offer a specific course on the topic. Multicultural education may be integrated into other courses.[101]

During Multicultural Week, administrators and specialists from the district office, teachers in district secondary schools, consultants, and university faculty make presentations to the interns on multicultural issues. These sessions attempt to sensitize interns to the perspectives, backgrounds, and instructional needs of students from different cultures. Most of the instructors are themselves persons of color. An analysis of the transcripts of the sessions in Multicultural Week was made and four main objectives were found:[102]

1. To influence interns' attitudes towards children culturally different from themselves and towards including information on cultural minorities and their contributions to history and knowledge

2. To inform trainees about the history, customs, language, family life, religion, values, and intra-group differences of various groups, including Asian-Americans, Afro-Americans, and Mexican-Americans and other Latinos

3. To inform interns about the effects of teacher behaviors (expectations and differences in "learning styles") on the achievement of students from non-Anglo backgrounds

4. To demonstrate pedagogical techniques—for dealing with controversial topics in the classroom, for learning cooperatively, for incorporating information on black leaders into teaching, and for assessing students' "learning styles"

According to this analysis, the program's emphasis on providing information about different cultural groups and the deleterious effects of prejudice and differential expectations, and demonstrating classroom techniques such as cooperative learning, is similar to the approach used in many traditional pre-service programs of teacher education. The LAUSD intern program, however, spends more time on multicultural education than is typically found in college-based programs.[103]

Mentoring

The third component of training and support is the mentor teacher program. California Senate Bill 813 specifies that if a district sets up a district intern program, it must provide mentors to guide and assist these new teachers for two years. The legislation allocates funds to districts participating in the mentor teacher program: $4,000 in stipends for each mentor, and an additional $2,000 per mentor to cover such costs as training, substitutes, release time, and travel. In addition to their $4,000 stipend-above-salary, LAUSD mentor teachers are paid mileage and have a $150 budget to buy curriculum materials for the interns. They are given 23 days of release time to work with interns, during which a substitute is assigned to their classrooms.

There are currently 1,058 mentor teachers in LAUSD assigned to work with all beginning teachers or teachers new to the district. In line with the district's emphasis on multicultural education, many of the interns will be assigned a mentor who is a person of color. Forty-three percent of mentors are from minority groups—approximately 1 percent American Indian, 4 percent Asian, 32 percent black, 8 percent Hispanic, and 57 percent white—a slightly higher overall percentage than in the total teacher population, which is 37 percent minority.[104]

The mentors are selected through an elaborate screening process (training is even provided for the selection committees) in which about two-thirds of the applicants are rejected. The mentor selection committee is composed of six teachers and five administrators. Teacher applicants submit written applications which are evaluated on such elements as educational background, educational experiences, teaching performance evaluations (based on the Stull criteria described in the next section), a personal statement, professional references, and service record for the last five years.[105] Those accepted are given a 30-hour training program based on research on effective teaching and mentoring techniques.[106] They are trained specifically in (1) the district's approach to instructional planning, classroom management, and organization which they will communicate to novices, and (2) techniques of classroom consultation, observation and coaching—for example,

how to write a "script" of the lesson they are observing and how to structure a conference with a novice teacher.[107]

New teachers are assigned to mentors on a 4:1 ratio, except in PSPs (priority staffing programs), where the ratio may be 2:1. Wherever possible, mentor teachers work in the same school and same subject area as the intern. Mentors provide guidance and support but do not evaluate the interns. In the first years of the program, at least 95 percent of the interns were assigned someone to work with them (about two-thirds of these were mentors selected and trained through the process just described; the rest were other teachers and administrators). In contrast, only 32 percent of California's first-year teachers from college certification programs and 71 percent of emergency credential teachers received such support from a mentor teacher.[108] These findings are in line with other research on alternative certification programs, which indicates that they offer more clinical supervision than the typical teacher education program.[109]

A key question is, what do the interns learn from mentor teachers? Research on mentoring in the LAUSD Intern Program indicates that mentor teachers, in line with the program's context-specific emphasis, tend to induct interns into current school policy, procedures, and instructional practices rather than engaging them in reflection on a variety of approaches to instruction.[110]

Criteria for Successfully Completing the Program

To successfully complete the program, an intern must attend the pre-service training, Multicultural Week, and two years of weekly seminars. There are no written assignments or examinations. Three times a year interns must complete forms that describe some of their own instructional practices, with a focus on classroom management and instructional planning. These forms must be shown to the site coordinator, the mentor teacher, and the principal so that each has a chance to monitor and react to how the teacher is managing instruction. Interns must attend all classes and make up those they miss by taking a Saturday class or some other equivalent experience.

The main evaluation of the intern is conducted by the school principal according to the criteria in the Stull Evaluation Guidelines, which is the state-mandated beginning teacher evaluation. The intern must receive positive evaluations from the school principal to remain in the intern program and to be recommended for a teaching credential. At least three times a year, the intern prepares a statement of instructional objectives for a class which the principal observes, and subsequently the intern teacher receives written feedback on his or her performance. The evaluation focuses on five areas of teacher performance: (1) achievement of instructional objectives evaluated primarily by student performance, (2) preparation and planning focusing on specifying instructional objectives and providing appropriate instructional materials, (3) classroom performance evaluated by adherence to the Madeline Hunter model, setting homework, and maintaining discipline, (4) general professional skills, including relations with other faculty and staff, professional appearance, and

record keeping, and (5) punctuality and attendance. The intern is graded as "satisfactory," "unsatisfactory," or "needs improvement" in 22 subcategories. If an intern receives more than three "needs improvement" grades, he or she may be removed from the program.

The criteria for successful completion of the program are thus strongly weighted toward demonstration of ability to teach in the particular classroom to which the teacher has been assigned, using the curriculum and approaches to instruction defined by the district, and performing to the satisfaction of the school principal. Interns are required to participate in classes that cover the foundational content covered in college-based programs, but they are not tested on this content, nor required to write papers that might demonstrate their understanding. Consistent with the local emphasis of the program, the requirements for completion are oriented towards success in the practice of teaching in this particular context as defined by the Stull Evaluation Guidelines.

Comparisons of LAUSD Interns with University-Educated Teachers

The LAUSD Intern Program provides a comprehensive program of on-the-job professional training which focuses on preparing teachers to work in the Los Angeles public schools. Eight hundred and fifty-five of these alternative-route teachers are currently teaching in LAUSD.[111] How do these teachers compare to university-educated teachers? This section discusses the findings of several recent studies which compared the pedagogical knowledge and skills of LAUSD secondary alternative-route teachers with those of conventionally educated teachers.[112]

Researchers from the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing compared the classroom effectiveness of 82 California alternative-route teachers (77 of them LAUSD interns) in relation to that of 32 university teacher education graduates and 34 emergency credential teachers.[113] On an average of three occasions, the beginning teachers were evaluated by trained observers on six criteria—classroom environment, student involvement, presentation skills, content and method, classroom management, and cognitive activity. There were no significant differences between the groups on any of the criteria. The researchers concluded that the alternative-route teachers, as a group, were as instructionally effective as their university-educated counterparts. This research, however, focused primarily on the generic characteristics of classroom management and instruction in which the LAUSD interns have been extensively trained. It did not look at the more substantive issues of teaching subject matter to diverse learners.

Between 1987 and 1990, researchers at the National Center for Research on Teacher Education studied the development of pedagogical knowledge and skills in LAUSD alternative-route interns and three groups of university-trained secondary math and English teacher candidates.[114] The study tracked the novice teachers through their teacher education program and into their first year of independent teaching, and involved repeated interviews with and classroom observations of each candidate. It focused specifically on teaching mathematics and writing to diverse learners.

In a 1990 analysis of the data on secondary mathematics teachers, little difference was found in mathematical knowledge and skill between the alternative-route and university-trained groups, either at the beginning or the end of the program.[115] Both groups of teachers could competently solve mathematical problems themselves—they knew the correct rules and procedures—but had difficulty explaining the underlying mathematical meaning of the concepts. The majority of teachers in both groups believed that effective teaching involved showing and telling students how to solve mathematical problems and giving them practice. They had difficulty in generating concrete examples or activities which would enable students to construct mathematical understanding. These ideas about effective teaching were manifested in their teaching practices.[116] The majority of novice teachers in both groups used traditional didactic instructional methods in their classrooms—teacher lecture and demonstration of problem solutions on the blackboard, followed by individual student work on problems from the textbook with feedback from the teacher. It can be argued that neither group of teachers is being prepared to teach mathematics in a way that will adequately develop students' conceptual understanding.[117] Both the traditional and alternative route approaches to teacher education produce teachers who focus on drilling algorithms into students.

The development of skills for teaching writing in secondary English teacher candidates in the LAUSD alternative route program and a group of secondary English teachers who graduated from a post-baccalaureate university program were compared.[118] Both groups of teachers came to teacher education with extensive subject matter preparation—all the candidates had completed baccalaureate degrees with an English major, with a GPA of 3.0 or more—and there were no significant differences in their content knowledge. Differences were found, however, in the candidates' pedagogical knowledge and instructional practices.

The university-educated English teachers were significantly more knowledgeable about specific approaches to teaching writing. They had gone through a teacher education program which emphasized the "process approach" to teaching writing, which views students as "authors" who own the text they are producing and who learn to improve their writing through the processes of drafting, revising, and publishing. All these teachers were extremely knowledgeable about this approach and, as part of their program, had developed an extensive curriculum resource file to draw on in their teaching practice. When these university-educated novice teachers began teaching in schools with high percentages of low-income and minority students, however, most of them had difficulty in implementing the process approach to writing in their multicultural classrooms. They quickly adopted the school district's competency-based drill-and-practice approach to teaching writing. It is argued that these novices did not use the student-centered curriculum because it was incompatible with their views of the students they were teaching.[119] Many of these teachers held a "cultural deficit" perspective on student achievement and believed that their poor and minority students' lack of enriching life experiences made it difficult for them to function as autonomous learners or to understand higher-order concepts. They believed that such students required a

structured drill-and-practice, and taught that way. This view of learners was more consonant with the school district's curriculum than the university's process approach.

In contrast, the alternative-route interns held higher expectations for low-income and minority students and attempted to develop curriculum and instruction responsive to the needs of diverse learners. Their approaches to instruction, however, were highly idiosyncratic and tended to be based on their own experiences as learners and prior life and work experience.[120] For example, one intern, Chad, a lay preacher and political activist, developed an approach to English instruction which focused almost exclusively on developing the ability to communicate orally. At times this worked very effectively. For example, he engaged low-achieving seventh and eighth graders in researching, writing, and debating arguments for and against year-round schooling. At other times, however, his approach was ineffective. For example, he tried to get a group of poor readers to sight-read plays aloud; and he taught basic vocabulary to an eleventh grade honors class. The majority of interns, like Chad, had difficulty in evaluating the appropriateness of their teaching practice and although highly creative, their approaches were often unresponsive to the needs of learners.

This preliminary research contrasting the development of instructional expertise in traditional and alternative routes into teaching only serves to emphasize the complexity of learning to teach, and reinforces the findings of other research on novice teachers. As has been found in studies of the teaching of mathematics, both the alternative-route and university-educated mathematics teachers appear to be dominated by a powerful subject culture that emphasizes a lockstep drill-and-practice approach to instruction.[121] They looked very different from the university-educated and alternative-route English teachers. Here the NCRTE studies support the finding that university-educated English teachers develop greater pedagogical sophistication than alternative-route teachers.[122] Unfortunately, as has been previously observed, the university-educated novice teachers were quickly socialized into the prevailing school culture.[123] The influence of personal perspectives[124] was also apparent in the practice of both groups of secondary English teachers: the LAUSD interns developed highly idiosyncratic approaches to instruction, and the university-educated teachers' views of diverse learners exerted a powerful influence on their developing practice. These findings indicate that many of the same factors operate in learning to teach in traditional and alternative routes to teacher certification. They underscore the research that has demonstrated that novice teachers are influenced by multiple factors, including personal history, subject matter specialization, the backgrounds of the learners they are teaching, and the school context, as well as their professional education.[125]

DISCUSSION

This paper uses a case study of the Los Angeles Unified School District Intern Program to examine the use of an alternative route to teacher licensure as a context-specific teacher recruitment and training policy. The findings indicate that the program is effective in attracting and retaining academically competent individuals to teach in inner-city schools in Los Angeles. It has a strong record, in comparison to national figures for college-based teacher education programs, in recruiting individuals in subject shortage areas, from minority groups, and individuals with positive dispositions towards teaching in urban schools.[126]

The alternative-route program in California is not a replacement for college-based teacher education—it is a context-specific recruitment policy. Alternative-route candidates represent less than 2 percent of California's newly credentialed teachers: 96 percent of these are trained in the LAUSD Intern Program.[127] The program has reduced the district's need to hire emergency credential instructors without impacting on the recruitment of conventionally educated and licensed teachers.

Alternative-route programs like the LAUSD intern program can be successful in recruiting teachers to work in hard-to-staff schools, but do they provide adequate teacher education? Critics have argued that teacher candidates in alternative-route programs receive little or no pedagogical preparation.[128] The LAUSD Intern Program does provide a program of professional preparation that is, on the surface, similar in the topics addressed and in required class hours to many college-based teacher education programs. It is, however, very different in its academic rigor and content. In most college-based programs, recommendation for a teaching credential is based on successful completion of university coursework—based on academic criteria of written essays and examinations—and a positive evaluation from a university supervisor based on approximately 10 to 16 weeks of supervised student teaching.[129] In LAUSD, the main criteria for being recommended for a teaching credential is a positive evaluation from the school principal based on two years of full-time teaching experience in an urban school. Although the program provides courses, these courses require little academic work.

The content of the courses also differs. University programs expose students to a wide variety of educational theories and curriculum and instructional approaches,[130] and faculty engage candidates in a process of reflection and critical evaluation of prevailing school practice.[131] The LAUSD Intern Program focuses on training interns to effectively implement the district's curriculum in a prescribed manner. The content of the coursework emphasizes the local and specific needs of an urban multicultural school district and student population instead of focusing on a wide variety of contexts.

What kind of teachers does the program produce? Preliminary research indicates that the LAUSD interns do not develop flexible or reflective approaches to instruction. Although the

mathematics teachers are characterized by their remarkably homogeneous didactic approaches to instruction, and the English teachers by their diversity of instructional approaches, both groups are essentially "singers with only one song."[132] They develop modal approaches to instruction which they apply and misapply routinely.

Do the alternative-route teachers differ significantly from their college-educated counterparts? The preliminary research from NCRTE, which compares secondary LAUSD interns with a sample of university-educated novice teachers, reveals some interesting similarities and differences between and within the groups. A primary differentiating factor was subject matter discipline irrespective of program. There were few differences between the university-trained and alternative-route mathematics teachers: both groups viewed mathematics as a body of facts and procedures to be memorized and used didactic show-and-tell approaches to instruction. But the mathematics teachers, across groups, looked very different from the English teachers who showed a greater diversity in their approaches to instruction. The effects of teacher education were apparent in the university-educated English teachers who showed a pedagogical sophistication not demonstrated by the LAUSD interns. They had difficulty, however, in applying their university-learned pedagogy with learners who were different from themselves. The alternative-route teachers, on the other hand, while feeling comfortable with the diverse learners they taught, developed highly idiosyncratic personalized approaches to instruction which often were inappropriately applied.

These similarities and differences between the secondary alternative-route and university-educated teachers emphasize the influence of subject matter, views of learners, and school context, as well as program, on novice teachers developing practice. The interactions may be quite different for teachers learning to teach in elementary schools, which traditionally place less emphasis on subject matter and more on "student-centered" approaches. The findings indicate the need for caution in making generalizations about either form of teacher preparation and they further demonstrate the importance of comparative research that looks at the influences of type of teacher preparation, level of schooling, teaching assignment, social and geographical context, and individual biography on learning to teach.

CONCLUSIONS

These different approaches to teacher education raise questions about the preparation of teachers for urban schools. Should teacher recruitment and training be context-specific or can it be context free? The LAUSD Intern Program attracts into teaching academically competent individuals with a strong commitment to working in its multicultural inner city schools—people who want to live and teach in Los Angeles. By focusing on educating "context-specific" teachers to fit in with local policies, practices, and procedures, however, the program may simply serve to socialize candidates into the prevailing school culture and institutionalize inadequate instructional practices. Many

college-based teacher education programs, on the other hand, while advocating critical analysis of and experimentation with a wide variety of approaches to instruction, appear to operate on the assumption that schools are monocultural and monosocial.[133] They aim to educate "context-free" teachers who can teach any group of students in any school in any part of the country. Such programs, however, have consistently failed to address the needs of urban schools. They do not recruit sufficient numbers of individuals who are committed to teach in urban schools[134] and most do not emphasize multicultural education in their curricula.[135]

The findings of this paper underscore the need for teacher educators and policymakers to consider issues of context when developing teacher recruitment policies and training programs. The demand for teachers willing to teach in multicultural student populations in inner-city schools will increase as the ethnic minority population grows and the urban areas continue to expand.[136] Traditional programs, unless radically restructured, are unlikely to recruit sufficient teachers to meet this need. Developing alternative-route programs that primarily serve to socialize teacher candidates into prevailing school practice, while providing teachers, will not help improve instruction for at-risk students. Universities need to work with school districts to develop programs that recruit teachers willing to teach in multicultural inner-city schools and to provide them with state-of-the-art professional preparation.

---

1 American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE). (1986), "Alternative Certification: A Position Statement of AACTE," *Journal of Teacher Education, 36(3)*, 24. See also H. D. Gideonse, "State Education Policy in Transition: Teacher Education," *Phi Delta Kappan, 66,* 1984, 205–208, and R. A. Roth, "Emergency Certificates, Misassignment of Teachers, and Other Dirty Little Secrets," *Phi Delta Kappan, 67(10)*, 1986, 725–727.

2 C. E. Feistritzer, *The Condition of Teaching: A State by State Analysis* (Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1985).

3 H. Cagampang and J. W. Guthrie. *Math, Science, and Foreign Language Instruction in California: Recent Changes and Prospective Trends* (Berkeley,: University of California, Policy Analysis for California Education, PACE, 1988). See also L. Darling-Hammond, L. Hudson, and S. Kirby. *Redesigning Teacher Education: Opening the Door for New Recruits to Science and Mathematics Teaching* (Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation, 1989); M. Haberman, "Proposals for Recruiting Minority Teachers: Promising Practices and Attractive Detours," *Journal of Teacher Education, 39 (4)*, 1988, 38–44; M. Haberman, "Alternative Teacher Certification Programs," *Action in Teacher Education, 8(2),* 1986, 13–18. Haberman, M. "The Rationale for Training Adults as Teachers," in C. Sleeter (Ed.), *Empowerment Through Multicultural Education* (Buffalo, NY: Suny Press, 1990), 275–286; C. T. Kerchner, "Shortages and Gluts of Public School Teachers: There Must Be a Policy Problem Here Somewhere," *Public Administrative Review, 44(4)*, 1984, 292–298; National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), *The Condition of Education* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, 1983).

[4] See J. N. Fox, "Restructuring the Teacher Work force to Attract the Best and Brightest,"*Journal of Education Finance, 10,* 1984, 214–237; B. P. Gray, "Let Scientists Teach in the Science Classroom," *Curriculum Review,* March/April 1987; and R. K. Wimpelberg and J. A. King, "Rethinking Teacher Recruitment," *Journal of Teacher Education, 34(1),* 1983, 5–8.

[5] S. Cooperman and L. Klagholtz, "New Jersey's Alternate Route to Teacher Certification," *Phi Delta Kappan, 66(10),* 1985, 691–695.

[6] C. E. Feistritzer, *Alternative Certification: A State-by-State Analysis 1990* (Washington, DC: National Center for Education Information, 1990).

[7] Association for School, College, and University Staffing (ASCUS). *Teacher Supply/Demand 1986* (Madison, WI: Author, 1986); L. Darling-Hammond, et al., 1989, op. cit.; H. M. Levin, *Solving the Shortage of Mathematics and Science Teachers* (Report No. 85–AZ) (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance, 1985); and J. Shymansky and B. Alridge, "The Teacher Crisis in Secondary School Science and Mathematics," *Educational Leadership, 40(2),* 1982, 61–62.

[8] Center for Education Statistics (CES). *Projections of Education Statistics to 1992–93* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, 1985); L. Darling-Hammond, *Beyond the Commission Reports: The Coming Crisis in Teaching* (Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, 1984).

[9] CES, 1985, op. cit.

[10] N. Carey, B. Mittman, and L. Darling-Hammond(1988), *Recruiting Mathematics and Science Teachers Through Non-traditional Programs: A Survey.* N-2736-FF/CSTP, (Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, 1988); Center for Education Statistics (CES), *Digest of Education Statistics* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, 1987); National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), *New Teachers in the Market, 1987 Update* , NCES 90–336 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, 1990a).

[11] American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE), *RATE III Teaching Teachers: Facts and Figures* (Washington, DC: Author, 1989).

[12] Carey, et al., 1988, op. cit.

[13] American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE). *RATE II Teaching Teachers: Facts and Figures* (Washington, DC: Author, 1987); Haberman, 1988 and 1990, op cit.; T. Stoddart, "Who is Entering the Alternate Routes into Teaching and What Views Do They Bring with Them," paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, 1988; Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, *Supply and Semand of Teachers in Wisconsin* (Madison: University of Wisconsin System, 1986).

[14] Haberman, 1988, op. cit.

[15] A. P. Smith, "The Critical Issue of Excellence and Equity in Competency Testing," *Journal of Teacher Education, 35(2),* 1984, 6–9; see also E. J. Middleton, E. J. Mason, W. E. Stilwell, and W. C. Parker, "A Model for Recruitment and Retention of Minority Students in Teacher Preparation Program," *Journal of Teacher Education, 1,* 1988, 14–18.

16 Darling-Hammond, 1984, op. cit.; Feistritzer, 1985, op. cit.; L. M. Post and M. Woesnner, "Developing a Recruitment and Retention Support System for Minority Students in Teacher Education," *Journal of Negro Education, 56(2)*, 1987, 203–211; and J. P. Smith and F. R. Welch, *Closing the Gap: Forty Years of Economic Progress for Blacks* (Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, 1986).

17 A. P. Smith, op. cit.

18 Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE). *Conditions of Children in California* (Berkeley: University of California, 1989).

19 T. A. Howe and J. A. Gervolich, *National Study of the Estimated Supply and Demand of Secondary Science and Mathematics Teachers* (Des Moines: Iowa Department of Public Instruction, and Ames, IA: Iowa State University, 1982; Levin, op. cit.; Shymansky and Alridge, op. cit.

20 National Council for Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM), *Mathematics Teacher Shortage: The Facts* (Reston, VA: NCTM, 1982).

21 CES, 1987, op. cit.

22 ASCUS, op. cit.; Shymansky and Alridge, op. cit.

23 Darling-Hammond et al., 1989, op. cit.

24 L. Darling-Hammond L. Hudson, "Pre-college Science and Mathematics Teachers: Supply, Demand and Quality," paper prepared for the National Science Foundation, 1987.

25 Feistritzer, 1985, op. cit.

26 Darling-Hammond et al., 1989, op. cit.; and C. E. Feistritzer, *The Making of a Teacher* (Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Information, 1984).

27 NCES, 1990a, op. cit.

28 Council for Basic Education (CBE), "The Widespread Abuse of Out-of-Field Teaching," *Education Digest*, February 1986, 36–39.

29 NCES, 1990a, op. cit.

30 See citation to Darling-Hammond in R. K. Landers, "Should Teaching Be Made into a Profession?" *Congressional Quarterly's Editorial Research Reports, 1(17)*, 1990, 254–266.

31 Ibid.

32 Educational Employment Quarterly, *Teacher Shortage: Fact or Fiction* (Sacramento: California Educational Personnel Services, Winter 1985).

33 H. Cagampang, W. I. Garms, T. J. Greenspan, and J. W. Guthrie, *Teacher Supply and Demand in California: Is the Reserve Pool a Realistic Source of Supply?* (Berkeley: University of California, Policy Analysis for California Education, PACE, 1986); Cagampang and Guthrie, 1988, op. cit.

34 Ibid.

35 Educational Employment Quarterly, op. cit.

36 Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE), *Conditions of Education in California, 1988* (Berkeley: University of California, PACE, 1988).

[37] Los Angeles Unified School District Personnel Division, *Teacher Demographics* (Los Angeles, CA: Author, 1986–90).

[38] Cagampang and Guthrie, 1988, op. cit.

[39] Ibid.

[40] PACE, 1988, op. cit.

[41] Ibid.

[42] California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, *Report on Teacher Supply: Enrollments in Professional Preparation Programs in California Institutions 1985–86*, (Sacramento, CA: Author, 1987b).

[43] PACE, 1988, op. cit.

[44] R. A. Roth, "California Contradictions: Creating Your Own Crisis," *Action in Teacher Education, 10(3)*, 1988, 41–45.

[45] PACE, 1988, op. cit.

[46] E. Boyer, *High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America* (New York: Harper and Row, 1983); National Commission on Excellence in Education, *A Nation at Risk* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983); National Science Board Commission on Pre-college Education in Mathematics, Science and Technology, *Educating Americans for the 21st Century* (Washington, DC: Author, 1983).

[47] B. P. Gray, "Let Scientists Teach in the Science Classroom," *Curriculum Review*, March/April 1987; Wimpelberg and King, op. cit.

[48] Haberman, 1990, op. cit.

[49] NCES, 1990a, op. cit.

[50] Haberman, 1990, op. cit.

[51] S. Feiman-Nemser, "Teacher Preparation: Structural and Conceptual Alternatives," in W. R. Houston, M. Haberman, and J. Sikula (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (New York: Macmillan, 1990), 212–223.

[52] N. E. Adelman, *An Exploratory Study of Teacher Alternative Certification and Retraining Programs* (Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates, Inc., 1986); Carey, et al., op. cit.; Stoddart, 1988, op. cit.

[53] Adelman, op. cit.; M. B. Neuweiler, *Teacher Education Policy in the States: A 50-State Survey of Legislative and Administrative Action* (Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1988).

[54] S. Cooperman, "In defense of New Jersey's alternate certification plan," *Education Week, 24*, June 5, 1985).

[55] Stoddart, 1988, op. cit.; see also T. Stoddart and R. E. Floden, "School District-Based Teacher Training: An Alternative Route to Teacher Certification." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 1989.

[56] California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. *The Effectiveness of the Teacher Trainee Program: An Alternate Route into Teaching in California* (Sacramento: Author, 1987a); LAUSD Personnel Division, 1986–90, op. cit.

[57] D. L. Ball and G. McDiarmid, "Research on Teacher Learning: Studying How Teachers' Knowledge Changes," *Action in Teacher Education,* 1988, 10(2), 17–24; see also National Center for Research on Teacher Education. "Teacher Education and Learning to Teach: A Research Agenda," *Journal of Teacher Education, 39(6),* 1988, 27–32.

[58] AACTE, 1989, op. cit.

[59] NCES, 1990a, op. cit.

[60] A. Morey, *Excellence in Professional Education: A Report of the Advisory Committee to Study Programs in Education in the California State University* (Long Beach: California State University System, 1983).

[61] ASCUS, 1986, op. cit.; LAUSD Personnel Division, 1986–90, op. cit

[62] Darling-Hammond, Hudson, & Kirby, 1989, op. cit.

[63] Cagampang & Guthrie, 1988, op. cit.; CES, 1987, op. cit.

[64] Holmes Group, *Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group* (East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group, 1986).

[65] Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy's Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century* (New York: Carnegie Corporation, 1986).

[66] See J. Lanier and J. Little, "Research on Teacher Education," in M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, 3rd ed. (New York: Macmillan, 1986), 527–569; V. Vance and P. C. Schlechty, "The Distribution of Academic Ability in the Teaching Force. Policy Implications," *Phi Delta Kappan, 64(1),* 1982, 22–27; and T. M. Weaver, "The Need for New Talent in Teaching," *Phi Delta Kappan, 61,* 1979, 29–46.

[67] Holmes Group, 1986, op. cit.

[68] NCES, 1990a, op. cit.

[69] Ibid.

[70] Levin, 1985, op. cit.

[71] NCES, 1990a, op. cit.

[72] P. C. Schlechty and V. Vance, Recruitment, Selection and Retention: The Shape of the Teaching Force," *Elementary School Journal, 83,* 1983, 469–87.

[73] Los Angeles Unified School District Personnel Division, *District Intern Program 1984–1989: Overview and Analysis* (Los Angeles: Author, 1989)

[74] Fox, 1984, op. cit; Gray, 1987, op. cit; see also M. Haberman, "The Rationale for Training Adults as Teachers," in C. Sleeter (Ed.), *Empowerment Through Multicultural Education* (Buffalo, NY: Suny Press, 1990), 275–286.

[75] NCES, 1990a, op. cit.

[76] Darling-Hammond, Hudson, and Kirby, 1989, op. cit.

[77] AACTE, 1989, op. cit.

78 NCES, 1990a, op. cit.

79 AACTE, 1989, op. cit.

80 National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). *Selected Characteristics of Public and Private School Teachers* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, 1990b).

81 NCES, 1990a, op. cit.

82 AACTE, 1989, op. cit.

83 Darling-Hammond, Hudson, and Kirby, 1989, op. cit.

84 PACE, 1989, op. cit.

85 PACE, 1988, op. cit.

86 M. Haberman, "Proposals for Recruiting Minority Teachers: Promising Practices and Attractive Detours," *Journal of Teacher Education, 39 (4)*, 1988, 38–44.

87 AACTE, 1989, op. cit.

88 Ibid.

89 M. L. Gomez and T. Stoddart (in press), "Learning to Teach Writing: The Balancing of Personal and Professional Perspectives," In R. Clift and C. Evertson (Eds.), *Complex Factors Influencing Research on Teaching and Teacher Education: Perspectives on Content, Curriculum and Culture* (Washington, DC: The ERIC Clearing House on Teacher Education and AERA Division K).

90 AACTE, 1989, op. cit.

91 Gomez and Stoddart (in press), op. cit.

92 Haberman, 1990, op. cit.

93 American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), "Alternative Certification: A Position Statement of AACTE" *Journal of Teacher Education, 36(3)*, 1986, 24. See also H. D. Gideonse, "State Education Policy in Transition: Teacher Education," *Phi Delta Kappan, 66*, 1984, 205–208, and R. A. Roth, "Emergency Certificates, Misassignment of Teachers, and Other Dirty Little Secrets," *Phi Delta Kappan, 67(10)*, 1986, 725–727.

94 California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, *Manual for Developing, Evaluating, and Approving Professional Preparation Programs for the Multiple Subjects/Single Subject Credentials* (Sacramento: Author, 1985).

95 Morey, 1983, op. cit; Roth, 1988, op. cit.

96 AACTE, 1987, op. cit.

97 Feiman-Nemser, 1990, op. cit; see also D. P. Scannell, "Fifth Year and Extended Programs," in M. Haberman and J. M. Backus (Eds.), *Advances in Teacher Education, Vol 3* (Northwood, NJ: Ablex, 1987), 168–180.

98 Feiman-Nemser, 1990, op. cit.

99 Los Angeles Unified School District. *Guidelines for Instruction: Secondary School Curriculum English*. Publication No. SC-863.14 (Los Angeles: Author, 1985).

100 See, for example, T. L. Good and J. E. Brophy, *Looking in Classrooms* (New York: Harper & Row, 1984).

[101] California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, *Manual for Developing, Evaluating, and Approving Professional Preparation Programs for the Multiple Subjects/Single Subject Credentials* (Sacramento: Author, 1987c).

[102] G. W. McDiarmid, "What To Do About Differences: A Study of Multicultural Education in the Los Angeles Unified School District," paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April 1990, p. 10.

[103] C. A. Grant.and W. G. Secada, "Preparing Teachers for Diversity," in W. Houston, M. Haberman, and J. Sikula (Eds), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (New York: Macmillan, 1989), 403–422.

[104] L. Weisbender, L. Champagne, and E. Maddahian, *Preventing Teacher Dropout: Volume I - Mentors Helping New LAUSD Teachers*. Publication No. 531 (Los Angeles: LAUSD Program Evaluation and Assessment Branch, 1989).

[105] Ibid.

[106] S. Feiman-Nemser, , M. B. Parker, and K. Zeichner. "Are Mentor Teachers Teacher Educators?" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April 1990..

[107] J. W. Little and L. Nelson, *A Leader's Guide to Mentor Training* (San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1990).

[108] California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 1987a, op. cit.

[109] Adelman, 1986, op. cit.

[110] Feiman-Nemser, et al., 1990, op. cit.

[111] LAUSD Personnel Division, 1986–90, op. cit.

[112] D. L. Ball.and S. Wilson, "Becoming a Mathematics Teacher Through College-Based and Alternate Routes: The Relationship Between Knowing Your Subject and Learning to Teach It," paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April 1990; California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 1987a, op. cit.; Gomez & Stoddart, in press, op. cit.; and T. Stoddart, "Learning to Teach English and Mathematics in an Alternative Route to Teacher Certification" (*The Curriculum Journal*, in press).

[113] California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 1987a, op. cit.

[114] Ball and McDiarmid, 1988, op. cit.; National Center for Research on Teacher Education, "Teacher Education and Learning to Teach: A Research Agenda,:" *Journal of Teacher Education, 39(6),* 1988, 27–32.

[115] Ball and Wilson, 1990, op. cit.

[116] Stoddart, in press, op. cit.

[117] Ball and Wilson, 1990, op. cit.

[118] Gomez and Stoddart, in press, op. cit.

[119] Ibid.

[120] Ibid.

121 I. Goodson, *School Subjects and Curriculum Change* (Lewes, England: Falmer Press, 1987); A. Porter, "A Curriculum Out of Balance: The Case of Elementary School Mathematics," *Educational Researcher, 18(5),* 1989, 9–15; Stoddart, in press, op. cit.; S. Stodolsky, *The Subject Matters: Classroom Activity in Math and Social Studies* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988).

122 P. L. Grossman, "Learning to Teach Without Teacher Education," *Teachers College Record, 91(2),* 1989, 191–208.

123 K. Zeichner and J. Gore, "Teacher Socialization," in W. R. Houston, J. Sikula, and M. Haberman (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (New York: Macmillan, 1989), 329–34.

124 K. Zeichner, B. R. Tabachnick, and K. Densmore, "Individual, Instructional and Cultural Influences on the Development of Teachers' Craft Knowledge," in J. Calderhead (Ed.), *Exploring Teachers' Thinking* (Eastbourne, England: Cassell, 1987), 21–59.

125 S. J. Ball and I. F. Goodson, *Teachers' Lives and Careers* (Lewes, England: Falmer Press, 1985); R. V. Bullough, Jr., *First Year Teacher: A Case Study* (New York: Teachers' College Press, 1989); N, Crow, "Preservice Teachers' Biography: A Case Study," paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC, April 1987; A. Hargreaves, *Curriculum and Assessment Reform* (Milton Keynes, England: Open University Press, 1989); Gomez and Stoddart, in press, op. cit.; L. S. Shulman, "Those Who Understand: Knowledge Growth in Teaching," *Educational Researcher, 15(2),* 1986, 4–14; Zeichner and Gore, 1989, op. cit.; Zeichner, et al., 1987, op. cit.

126 AACTE, 1989, op. cit.; NCES, 1990a, op. cit.

127 California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 1987a, op. cit.

128 Gideonse, 1984, op. cit.; D. Watts, "Alternate Routes to Teacher Certification: A Dangerous Trend," *Action in Teacher Education, VIII(2),* 1986, 25–29.

129 Feiman-Nemser, 1990, op. cit.

130 K. Howey and N. Zimpher, *Profiles of Preservice Teacher Education* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989).

131 Feiman-Nemser, 1990, op. cit.

132 Stoddart, in press, op. cit.

133 A. R. Contreras, "Multicultural Attitudes and Knowledge of Education Students at Indiana University," paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April 1988.

134 AACTE, 1989, op. cit.; Haberman, 1990, op. cit.

135 Grant and Secada, 1989, op. cit.

136 Ibid.